REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 10-20 remain in the application and are subject to examination. Claim 10 has been amended.

Applicant respectfully points out that the Office Action Summary states that claims 1-9 have been withdrawn, however claims 1-9 had been cancelled in the preliminary amendment filed on January 23, 2006.

Under the heading "Claim Objection" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 10.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 10, 11, 13-15 and 18 have been rejected as being obvious over EP 0825 506 A2 to Thibault et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,142 B2 to Paavilainen et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicants respectfully traverse because it is believed that contrary to the opinion of the Examiner, many of the claimed features are not shown in the prior art. Even though applicants have amended claim 10, it is believed that the amendment need not be used as a basis for requiring a new search since many of the other claimed features are not shown in the prior art. Claim 10 has

been amended to use the terms "identical interface" instead of "standard interface". It is believed that this change will more clearly convey that the input interface of each processing routine is identical. Support for the change can be found by referring to the translation of the international application at page 3, lines 15-17.

Thibault et al. disclose a method for data exchange between an operator workstation and process control equipment. The operator workstation is distantly located from the control equipment using a communication system including hardware and software components, for transmitting data between the operator workstation and the control equipment. Thus, the operator can send commands to the process control equipment for selecting data about the system being controlled. No control means for data exchange are disclosed in Thibault et al. Paavilainen et al. describe a method and system for dynamic memory management in a telecommunication system.

Claim 10 defines a method for data exchange including:

1. a communication unit,

2. a data source, and

3. a runtime system between the communication unit and the data source, the runtime system including hardware components and

software components for transmitting data between the data source and the communication unit;

4. controlling and/or monitoring a data exchange between the communication unit and the data source with a processing sequence;

5. the processing sequence comprising processing routines each having an identical input interface;

6. calling the processing routines in succession and supplying data in a called processing routine to the input interface of an immediately adjoining processing routine; and

7. managing, with the runtime system, a dynamic memory area and accessing the memory area to stipulate an order wherein the processing routines are called.

Contrary to the invention defined by claim 10, applicants believe that Thibault et al. do not disclose any controlling and/or monitoring of data exchange. According to Thibault et al., a command/question for data is sent to the command processor 25 via the network 18. The command triggers the command processor 25 to collect the requested data from the stations 23 and to send the requested data back to the operator workstation. Based on that, Thibault et al. disclose a method for remote control of a system to be

controlled. However, the data exchange itself is not controlled, see for example col. 7, line 55 through col. 8, line 1. Therefore, applicants believe that the feature denoted above as feature 4 is not disclosed by Thibault et al.

Furthermore, applicants believe that Thibault et al. do not disclose the features denoted above as 5 and 6. According to the Examiner, the front end 25a, the object manager 25c and the commands "omopen list", "dpchange" and "omupdate" are to be considered as "processing routines". According to the Examiner, the "processing routines" each have a standard input interface (now defined as an identical input interface) and are called in succession, and the data in a called processing routine is supplied to the input interface of an immediately adjoining processing routine.

Applicants do not share the Examiner's view. Thibault et al. do not disclose "processing routines" each having a standard or, as now defined, an identical input interface. Thibault et al. disclose a front end 25a that is a simplified interface to the object manager 25c. The operator workstation cannot communicate with the object manager (25c) directly. As can be seen in column 7 lines 7 - 18; 34 - 37, the object manager (25c) is configured to receive pointer based parameters, while the front end (25a) is configured to receive text strings.

The "processing routines" are also not called in succession, because the front end 25a receives a command send by the operator and transmits the command

to the object manager 25c, whereupon the object manager 25c sends the requested data back to the front end 25a. Therefore, applicants believe that the claimed features denoted above as 5 and 6 are not disclosed by Thibault et al.

Moreover, applicants believe that Thibault et al. do not disclose feature 7 denoted above. Since the order of the "processing routines" is basically fixed, there is no need for a method step which stipulates the order of the "processing routines". The operator only has the option of starting commands in an expedient and basically fixed order (Fig.2). Thus, Thibault et al. do not disclose feature 7 denoted above.

Applicants believe it is clear that the claimed features 4, 5, 6 and 7, which are denoted as such above, are not disclosed in Thibault et al. Applicants therefore believe that even if it were obvious to combine the teachings of Thibault et al. and Paavilainen et al., as alleged by the Examiner, the invention defined by claim 10 would not have been obtained.

Applicants also believe that the feature denoted above as feature 7 is not obvious over the teachings in Thibault et al. and Paavilainen et al. Paavilainen et al. merely disclose dynamically allocating memory in a subscriber identity module of a mobile station. Applicants believe that Paavilainen et al. do not teach or suggest anything that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Thibault et al. with a dynamic memory area in a manner resulting in

feature 7 specified above.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 7 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 12, 16, 17, and 19-20 have been rejected as being obvious over EP 0825 506 A2 to Thibault et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,142 B2 to Paavilainen et al. and further in view of in view of published U.S. Patent Application 2003/0014500 A1 to Schleiss et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants believed claims 12, 16, 17, and 19-20 are not obvious for the reasons given above with regard to claim 10.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 10. Claim 10 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 10.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 10-20 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of one month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of $120.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Laurence A. Greenberg/
Laurence A. Greenberg
(Reg. No. 29,308)

MPW:cgm

October 4, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101